

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA
PRADESH

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 28450 of 2015

BETWEEN

G.Guravaiah

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department and others

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 03.09.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether his Lordship wish to see the
fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

-
-

ORDER:-

Heard.

2. The order of the Tahsildar, cancelling the pattadar passbook granted to the petitioners passed in file No.B/1190/13 dated 16.01.2014 is questioned, primarily, on the ground that petitioners were not given any notice prior to cancellation order. It is also stated that the original assignee is petitioner No.1, whereas the proceedings are issued against petitioner No.2 and the allegations of

non-cultivation of the land are also denied. But however the order of the Tahsildar itself shows that the assignee was given a notice why DKT Patta should not be cancelled, but no explanation was submitted and only after due enquiry the said order was passed. It is also mentioned that petitioner No.1 is already holding other lands as stated in the impugned order.

3. In view of the specific averment in the impugned order that the assignee against whom the said order was passed was notified before passing the order and only in the absence of explanation the said order was passed. It is evident that *prima facie* there is no violation of principles of natural justice. Hence, no reasons to entertain the writ petition especially as petitioners have effective remedy of preferring an appeal.

Hence, with the liberty to the petitioners to avail such appellate remedy, the writ petition is dismissed. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

September 1, 2015

Note: -

Registry shall return Ex.P1 impugned herein
to the learned counsel for the petitioner
as the true copy of the said document
is already filed along with the writ petition.

{B/o}
LMV